

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-35 are pending in the application, with 1, 9, 19, 20, 21, 25, 29, 33, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 7 and 22 are amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 19-20, 25-28, and 33. Furthermore, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the examiner's indication that claims 3-6, 10-12, and 16-18 would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Claim Objections

In paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 22 was objected to because of informalities surrounding the use of pronouns in the claim. This claim has been amended above, and thus Applicants assert that this objection is now moot. Claim 7 has been amended similarly. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 7-9, 13-15, 21-24, 29-32, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,858 to Raimbault et al. (hereinafter Raimbault). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and request that it be withdrawn.

Differences exist between Raimbault and the claimed embodiments of the present invention. For example, claim 1 recites the following:

responding to each bit of the series of bits with a corresponding bit of the second bit pattern.

Further, claim 9 recites the following:

wherein a first bit pattern received from a reader causes said tag to respond to a binary traversal with the first bit pattern; and
wherein a second bit pattern received from a reader causes said tag to respond to a binary traversal with the second bit pattern.

Moreover, claim 21 recites the following:

transmitting a first at least one bit to the population of tags cause the tags to respond to a binary traversal operation with a second bit pattern that is different from the first bit pattern; and

Furthermore, claim 34 recites:

transmitting a first at least one bit to the population of tags to cause tags to respond to a binary traversal operation with the first bit pattern;

Raimbault does not teach these features of claims 1, 9, 21 and 34.

In col. 8, lines 23+ Raimbault discloses a method for interrogating tags. In this method, all of the tags are first initialized and then the "station sends a succession of test interrogations corresponding to different possible values of the first digit of tag codes." Next a "given tag responds to a test interrogation by a tone or a BIP signal if the digit of its code corresponding to the index." Thus Raimbault teaches a method in which a tag responds to an interrogation with either a BIP signal or a tone, not "with a corresponding bit of the second bit pattern" as is stated in claim 1. Because Raimbault does not teach each and every element of claim 1, claim 1 is not anticipated by Raimbault.

Moreover, since Raimbault teaches that the basic method mentioned above continues until "all digits in a tag have been recovered," each tag responds to the binary traversal with a series of one or more tones or BIP signals, not a "first bit pattern" or "second bit pattern" as recited in claim 9, a "second bit pattern" as recited in claim 21, or a "first bit pattern" as recited in claim 34. Because Raimbault does not teach each and every element of claims 9, 21, and 34, claims 9, 21, and 34 are not anticipated by Raimbault.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 21, and 34 are patentable over Raimbault, for at least these reasons. Furthermore, independent claim 29 is also patentable over Raimbault for reasons similar to those for claim 21, and further in view of their own respective features. Claims 2, 7, and 8 which depend from claim 1, claims 13-15, which depend from claim 9, claims 22-24, which depend from claim 21, claims 30-32, which depend from claim 29, and claim 35, which depends on claim 34 are also patentable over Raimbault for at least the reasons regarding their respective independent claim, and further in view of their own features. Thus,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7-9, 13-15, 21-24, 29-32, 34 and 35 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey S. Weaver
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,608

Date: 8-31-06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

555540_2.DOC